

**RECORD OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant through the attorney on the record and identified below thank the Examiner Ronald Baum for granting Applicant two telephone interviews on June 27 and July 27, 2006, respectively.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), the following is submitted as a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action. The following statement is intended to comply with the requirements of MPEP § 713.04 and expressly sets forth: (A) a brief description of the nature any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted; (B) identification of the claims discussed; (C) identification of specific prior art discussed; (D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed; (E) the general thrust of the principal arguments; (F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters; and (G) the general results or outcome of the interview, if appropriate.

On June 27, 2006, the undersigned contacted the examiner to discuss the Office Action of May 23, 2006 and the reasons that the rejection was maintained in view of the prior amendment. The examiner indicated that the use of the term "flow" in the claims was considered too broad in view of the prior art and that further limitation was required. (A) no exhibits were shown or discussed; (B) the independent claims were discussed, in particular certain aspects relating to how the claims differ from the primary applied reference, the *Shipley* patent (6,119,236); (C) the *Shipley* patent (6,119,236) was discussed; (D) No proposed amendments were officially presented or discussed, but the claim amendments presented in this paper are consistent with the discussion; (E) the general thrust of the discussion was as set forth below in the next paragraphs; (F) no other matters were discussed; and (G) the examiner indicated that Applicant shall submit proposed claim amendments, and he would talk with Applicant again.

Per the examiner's request, Applicant informally submitted proposed claim amendments to the examiner for discussion only by an e-mail attachment on June 29,

2006. (The amendments in the present amendment are identical with those proposed amendments.)

On July 27, 2006, the undersigned again contacted the examiner to discuss the proposed amendments, as submitted for discussion on June 29, 2006: (A) Aside from the proposed amendments, no exhibits were shown or discussed; (B) the independent claims were discussed, in particular certain aspects relating to how the claims differ from the primary applied reference, the *Shipley* patent (6,119,236); (C) the *Shipley* patent (6,119,236) was discussed; (D) the proposed amendments (as herein submitted) were informally presented and discussed, and the claim amendments presented in this paper are consistent with the informally presented; (E) the general thrust of the discussion was as set forth below in the next paragraphs, especially as regards the amendment of a client/server (C/S) flow and the notion of the concern index; (F) no other matters were discussed; and (G) the examiner indicated to Applicant that the proposed claim amendments appeared to be acceptable and define over the art. However, no agreement on particular claim language was reached, pending submission of a formal amendment via RCE.

The amendments herein and comments that follow are intended to be consistent with the discussion during the interviews.

In the event that the foregoing record is not considered complete and accurate, the Examiner is respectfully requested to bring any incompleteness or inaccuracy to the attention of the undersigned.